
Flourishing as Law

A Minibook on Eudaimonocracy

Glimmerant
May 15, 2026

The Idea of Eudaimonia

Before we can understand a political system built around human flourishing, we need to understand what flourishing actually means.

The word eudaimonia comes from ancient Greek. It is often translated as happiness, but that translation is too thin. Happiness in the modern sense can mean a mood or a passing feeling. Eudaimonia is something deeper: a kind of life that is going well, lived with purpose, virtue, and genuine engagement with the world.

Aristotle, who gave us the most thorough account of eudaimonia, argued that every human being has a natural aim. We are not here simply to survive or accumulate things. We are here to flourish, and flourishing means exercising our best capacities. It means being honest, courageous, generous, and just. It means building real relationships and contributing to something larger than ourselves.

This is different from simply feeling good. A person could feel perfectly content while wasting their abilities or treating others badly. Aristotle would not call that flourishing. Eudaimonia requires that a person actually become good, not just feel good, and that they live a life whose shape, taken as a whole, reflects genuine human excellence.

The good life is not a destination. It is a practice.

The reason this matters for politics is straightforward. If the purpose of life is to flourish, then the purpose of a good society should be to make flourishing possible for everyone in it. That simple idea, taken seriously, leads to a very different kind of government than the ones most of us live under today.

What Is a Eudaimonocracy

The word eudaimonocracy is a modern coinage that applies an old philosophical idea to the question of how we should organize political power.

A eudaimonocracy is a system of governance whose primary aim is the genuine flourishing of its citizens. Not GDP growth. Not national prestige. Not the preferences of the most organized interest groups. The measure of good governance, in this model, is whether people are living well in the fullest sense of that phrase.

A eudaimonocracy does not promise that every citizen will be happy all the time. Life involves difficulty, loss, and failure, and no government can change that. What it promises is that the structures, laws, and institutions of society will be oriented toward giving people the conditions in which genuine flourishing is possible.

Those conditions include material basics like food, shelter, healthcare, and safety. But they also include things that are harder to measure: meaningful work, education that develops real capacities, communities where trust and belonging are possible, and political participation that feels genuine rather than purely theatrical.

A government worthy of its citizens does not manage them. It cultivates the ground beneath them.

A eudaimonocracy is not a specific set of institutions but a framework for evaluating those institutions. The organizing question of governance becomes: are our people actually flourishing, and if not, what are we going to do about that.

Core Principles of Flourishing Governance

A eudaimonocracy is held together by a set of commitments that run deeper than any particular policy. These principles give the system its direction.

The first principle is the primacy of human development. Education, healthcare, and opportunity are understood as the basic infrastructure of a good society, as essential as roads or courts, not byproducts of economic growth or charitable add-ons for those left behind.

The second principle is that virtue is a public concern. This does not mean the state tells people how to live in private. It means that civic culture and institutions are designed to support honesty, fairness, and civic engagement. A eudaimonocracy takes seriously what kind of character its institutions tend to produce in citizens over time.

The third principle is that well-being cannot be reduced to income. A eudaimonocracy attends to the quality of relationships in a community, rates of social isolation, levels of civic trust, and whether people feel their lives have meaning. These things matter independently of what the economy is doing.

Laws that only restrain the worst behavior are not enough. Good governance also encourages the best.

The fourth and fifth principles are subsidiarity and solidarity working together. Decisions should be made as close to people's actual lives as possible, but the flourishing of one part of society cannot come at the expense of abandoning another. Local autonomy and shared responsibility are not opposites; in a eudaimonocracy, they depend on each other.

Eudaimonocracy and Democracy Compared

Modern democracy is the most widely admired form of government in the world. How does a eudaimonocracy relate to it, and where do the two ideas part ways?

At their best, democracy and eudaimonocracy are deeply compatible. Having a genuine voice in decisions that affect your life is itself a component of flourishing. Participation in civic life and being treated as an equal in the political realm are not small things. They are part of what it means to live with dignity.

But democracy as typically practiced has a procedural focus. It is concerned with how decisions are made, through voting, representation, and majority rule. It is largely silent on what those decisions should achieve. A perfectly functioning democracy can vote for policies that diminish human flourishing, and by purely democratic logic, that outcome is legitimate.

A eudaimonocracy adds a substantive layer to democratic procedure. It says the purpose of collective self-governance is not simply to express preferences but to make good choices about how to live together. It introduces the question of what is actually good for people as a legitimate and permanent object of public deliberation.

Democracy tells us who speaks. Eudaimonocracy asks what we should be saying.

Another key difference lies in the metrics of success. Democratic governments tend to measure success through electoral outcomes and economic indicators. A eudaimonocracy would supplement these with measures of genuine well-being: life satisfaction, social connection, mental health, sense of purpose, and civic trust.

Welfare States and Their Limits

The welfare state is the closest real-world approximation of a government that takes human well-being seriously. But it falls short of eudaimonocracy in important ways.

Welfare states, developed primarily in Europe during the twentieth century, represent a genuine advance in political thinking. They recognize that markets alone cannot ensure everyone has what they need to live a decent life. Societies with strong welfare states consistently score well on global measures of human flourishing.

But welfare states often focus on material deficits rather than on positive flourishing. They aim to prevent poverty, illness, and destitution, which is essential, but they have little to say about whether people find meaning in their work, whether communities are strong, or whether citizens feel genuinely connected to public life.

A second limit is bureaucratic alienation. Welfare systems can become impersonal structures that deliver services to people as passive recipients rather than active participants. This erodes the sense of agency and dignity that is central to genuine flourishing. A eudaimonocracy attends not just to the quantity of assistance provided but to how that assistance is delivered.

Preventing misery and enabling flourishing are not the same project, though both are necessary.

Nordic countries like Denmark, Finland, and Iceland come closest among existing states to a eudaimonocratic orientation. They consistently rank highest on well-being indices, with strong civic trust, good work-life balance, and cultural norms that value community and equality. They are not perfect models, but they demonstrate that governing with flourishing as a serious priority is not utopian.

Virtue, Utility, and the Good Life

Eudaimonocracy sits within a long conversation about what makes a life good and what makes a society good. Two major rivals in that conversation are virtue ethics and utilitarianism.

Utilitarianism holds that the right policy is the one that produces the most happiness for the most people. A eudaimonocracy shares this concern for outcomes and for everyone's welfare. But it differs in its understanding of what welfare actually means. Utilitarianism tends to equate welfare with preference satisfaction. A eudaimonocracy holds that this picture is too thin. Some preferences, when satisfied, do not lead to flourishing at all.

Virtue ethics focuses on character. It asks not just what outcomes we produce but what kind of people we are becoming. Aristotle placed virtue at the center of the good life, and a eudaimonocracy follows him in this. Good governance is not only about distributing resources or maximizing aggregate scores. It is also about fostering conditions in which people can develop and exercise genuinely good character.

Where eudaimonocracy parts from some versions of virtue ethics is in its social emphasis. A narrow virtue ethics can become individualistic, focused on the moral development of each person in isolation. A eudaimonocracy insists that flourishing is inherently relational. We cannot flourish as isolated individuals. We flourish through our communities, our friendships, and our participation in shared life.

To maximize satisfaction is not the same as to cultivate excellence. Both matter, but they are not the same thing.

The synthesis that eudaimonocracy offers is this: measure social success by whether people are becoming good, not just whether they feel good or have what they say they want. Structure political institutions to make that kind of becoming available to everyone, not only the fortunate few.

How a Eudaimonocracy Would Actually Govern

Theory must eventually come to ground. What would a government actually look like if it genuinely organized itself around human flourishing?

A eudaimonocratic government would begin by changing what it measures. National success would be tracked not primarily through GDP but through a well-being index capturing life satisfaction, social trust, health, meaningful engagement, and civic participation. Bhutan's Gross National Happiness framework and New Zealand's Living Standards Framework are real-world attempts that point in this direction.

In education, the emphasis would shift from credential acquisition to genuine human development. Schools would attend seriously to ethical development, emotional intelligence, critical thought, and civic responsibility. This does not mean abandoning academic rigor. It means embedding rigor in a broader vision of what a person ought to become, not merely what they ought to produce for the labor market.

In economic policy, a eudaimonocratic government would not simply defer to market outcomes. It would ask which forms of work support human dignity and which degrade it. It would treat working conditions, working hours, and time for family and civic life as political priorities, not just matters of private arrangement between employer and employee.

An education that produces employable graduates but not good people has missed the point.

In political life, a eudaimonocracy would invest heavily in the quality of public deliberation. Citizens' assemblies and participatory forums would function as real instruments of governance, because genuine civic participation is itself a component of flourishing, not a decorative feature added to make people feel consulted.

The Role of the Citizen

A eudaimonocracy is not something a government delivers to passive people. It requires a particular kind of citizen to sustain it.

Aristotle was clear that the political community was not just a convenience for people who otherwise wanted to be left alone. The community was itself essential to human flourishing. We are, as he put it, political animals. We are the kind of beings who need to participate in shared governance to fully develop our capacities as people.

A eudaimonocracy places real expectations on its citizens. It expects them to engage in public life, to think carefully about common problems, to take on civic responsibilities, and to treat fellow citizens with genuine concern rather than merely tolerating them. These are demanding expectations, and it is worth being honest about that.

At the same time, a eudaimonocracy recognizes that these capacities for citizenship must be developed and supported. If people are exhausted, isolated, or economically precarious, they will not become engaged citizens simply because a government tells them to. The conditions for good citizenship must be cultivated, which is why education, community infrastructure, and economic security are political priorities rather than personal lifestyle choices.

Good governance is not something you receive. It is something you practice.

There is also a role for civic virtue in daily life beyond formal political participation. How people treat neighbors, whether they contribute to local institutions, and whether they take the common good seriously: all of this is part of what it means to be a citizen in the deepest sense. A eudaimonocracy does not legislate this, but it creates conditions in which it becomes more natural and more expected.

Challenges and Honest Criticisms

Any serious political idea must be tested against its hardest objections. Eudaimonocracy faces several, and they deserve straight answers.

The first and most serious objection is the paternalism problem. Who decides what constitutes flourishing? If the government claims the authority to define the good life, it can use that claim to impose its vision on people who have different values and different ways of living. History offers many examples of regimes that justified control over citizens by claiming to know what was best for them.

A eudaimonocracy must take this danger seriously. The answer is to pursue flourishing in a way that is humble, plural, and subject to democratic scrutiny. The role of government is to provide conditions and capabilities, not to dictate life plans. Following Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, the goal is to expand the real freedoms people have to live lives they have reason to value, not to prescribe a single vision of the good.

The second objection concerns measurability. If we cannot agree on a single measure of well-being, how can government be held accountable to it. This is partly answered by the growing field of well-being science, which has developed robust tools for measuring life satisfaction, social trust, and sense of meaning. These measures are imperfect but no less reliable than GDP as a proxy for human welfare.

The aim is not to prescribe the good life but to make it genuinely possible for everyone.

The third objection is practical: governments are clumsy and prone to capture by powerful interests. Even if the theory is sound, political institutions may use the language of flourishing as rhetorical cover for ordinary agendas. A eudaimonocracy would need strong accountability mechanisms, transparent measurement, and genuine participatory oversight to prevent its ideals from being hollowed out over time.

A Path Worth Walking

We have covered the theory, the comparisons, the practical implications, and the hard criticisms. What remains is the question of direction.

Eudaimonocracy is not a finished political system ready to be installed. It is a way of orienting governance, a set of questions that a society can take seriously if it chooses to. The questions are simple and demanding at once: are our people actually flourishing, and if not, what are we going to change about that.

Most governments are preoccupied with growth, security, and electoral survival. These concerns are not illegitimate, but they are not sufficient. A society that is growing economically while declining in trust, meaning, and civic life is not a society that is doing well, whatever its aggregate statistics might say.

The good news is that the gap between current governance and eudaimonocratic governance is not as large as it might seem. Better mental health care, more meaningful education, stronger communities, and economic arrangements that respect human dignity are widely shared aspirations. What is missing is not the desire but the framework that brings these aspirations together and treats them as the core purpose of governance rather than optional additions to it.

The real measure of a civilization is not what it produces, but how fully it allows its people to become who they are capable of being.

Walking toward a eudaimonocracy does not require a revolution. It requires a sustained shift in what we value, what we measure, and what we hold our governments accountable for. That is a high standard. It is also the right one.